

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 14-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7 and 12 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Tsui and Hong during the January 23, 2007 personal interview are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection was discussed during the January 23 personal interview. Applicants' representative argued that the wording of the claims was not directed to a "computer program per se" without hardware at least because of the variously recited elements, devices, and "means for" set forth in claims 7 and 12. Without conceding the propriety of the interpretation, or the assertions, of the Office Action, claims 7 and 12 are amended to obviate the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection. These amendments were discussed during the January 23 personal interview. The Examiners agreed that such amendments would be sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejections.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §101 are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120648 to Ball et al. (hereinafter "Ball"); rejects claims 4, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ball; rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ball in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,952,801 to Warmus et al. (hereinafter

"Warmus"); and rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ball in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,957,384 to Jeffery et al. (hereinafter "Jeffery"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Without conceding the Office Action's interpretation of the pending claims or Ball, and solely to advance prosecution of the application, claims 1, 7 and 12 are amended in view of the Examiners' suggestions during the personal interview. The amendments to claims 1, 7 and 12 were discussed during the January 23 personal interview with the Examiners. The Examiners agreed that the applied prior art references do not teach all of the features of the independent claims at least because Ball does not teach the features of, in response to an initial request for a selected information object and without user intervention subsequent to the initial request, obtaining a most recent version of the information object as the selected version of the information object requested by the user, obtaining a previous version of the information object based on a result of identifying the user, the previous version of the information object being a version of the information object most recently accessed by the user, automatically determining a difference between the selected version of the information object and the previous version of the information object, and automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference, as is positively recited in independent claim 1. Claims 7 and 12 are likewise allowable over Ball, or Ball and Jeffery, for at least the inclusion of similar features.

None of the other prior art references are applied in a manner to overcome the identified deficiencies in Ball, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested such features.

For at least the above reasons, the applied prior art references do not teach, nor can they reasonably be considered to have suggested, all of the combinations of features positively recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 12. Additionally claims 3-6, 10, 11 and 14-16 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied prior art


references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on allowable independent claims 1, 7 and 12, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 14-16 over any combination of the applied prior art references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 14-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay  
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:JEG/kxm

Date: January 30, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--